



University  
of Glasgow

Banks, I. and Pollard, T. (2016) Editorial. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*, 11(2-3), pp. 59-60. (doi:10.1080/15740773.2017.1366399)

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/146832/>

Deposited on: 4 September 2017

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## Editorial

This editorial covers two issues of volume 11, which have been delayed for a number of reasons, none of which are interesting enough to detail. However, apologies for the delay in getting these issues out and we are now getting back on track. Thank you all for your patience.

So we have two issues released together, and the two cover different areas. There are links between the articles in each issue, although there are no specific themes. Issue 11.2 covers the late Medieval to the early Modern, which is a time period that we have neglected in recent volumes of the Journal. The three papers are diverse; Anne Curry and Glenn Foard consider the issue of the dead from late medieval battlefields, and why they are so rarely discovered, while Lauren McIntyre discusses a mass burial from York that appears to date from the English Civil War. Lying between them chronologically, Alexander Hodgkins provides an account of the little-known battle of London from 1554, part of Wyatt's Rebellion in the reign of Queen Mary of England. While a much smaller battle than those we are commemorating in the First World War, it was no less devastating to those involved. All three papers deal with the aspect of conflict that is easy to ignore, which is that conflict results in the deaths of individuals, rarely glorious and nearly always bloody. The period covered by the papers, which runs from battles that are recognisable as part of the Medieval world to battles that are clearly part of the early modern world, is a time of transition and change. Gunpowder replaced archery (though bows were still in use at the battle of Tippermuir in 1644), the pike forced a change in the role of cavalry, but firearms were starting to be the only effective weapon on the battlefield. A time of change and evolution, of technological advance, but with the same outcome of men dying and people's lives being devastated.

In contrast, issue 11.3 is much more modern, with all the papers relating to World War II. Gilly Carr reports on her work on Alderney at a labour camp for the Nazis during the Occupation, which is accompanied by a short paper by Peter Masters on the geophysical surveys of the site. This is followed by a multi-authored paper on the mass breakout attempt by German prisoners at Bridgend PoW camp in Wales in March 1945. This shares a theme of incarceration with Carr, and of geophysical survey with Masters, but is a very different paper as it considers the history of WWII escape attempts. Little remains of either Bridgend camp or of Lager Wick on Alderney, so these papers are valuable in rescuing a part of the archaeological record which has been largely neglected until very recently. The final paper is by Max Meredith, and is an unusual combination of archaeological and civil engineering methodologies to investigate aspects of the Atlantic Wall in the Channel Islands.

This second collection of papers have similarities and differences, but fundamentally share a technological approach to the archaeology, and investigate sites of WWII that have been largely overlooked. It is an unfortunate fact that in Britain, since the 1960s, there has been a great deal of destruction of sites from WWII. This is understandable as new generations seek to make the landscape one that works for them, but much of this destruction post-dates the 1990s. Much of the destruction comes from the days of PPG16 and NPPG5, where archaeological sites were supposed to be protected for future generations, either in situ or through record by fieldwork. While this may

have worked for prehistoric sites, it clearly has not worked for twentieth century sites, and many have been destroyed for development without record. Few sites of WWII have attracted much attention as sites of heritage, though as 2039 gets closer, this will inevitably change. However, unless attitudes to sites of this era change soon, when that change comes, little will be left to preserve.

Iain Banks & Tony Pollard

Centre for Battlefield Archaeology, University of Glasgow, UK

[editors-jca@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:editors-jca@glasgow.ac.uk)